Docket No.: 2003-0017

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 are amended without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejection of Claims 1-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Deng et al. (Distributed Speech Processing in MiPad's Multimodal User Interface, IEEE Transactions on Speech and Audio Processing, Vol. 10, No. 8, November 2002) ("Deng et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Deng et al. fail to teach each limitation of the claims and in fact fundamentally teaches away from the present invention.

We first turn to claim 1. Claim 1 recites a computing device within the network that adapts parameters of an automatic speech recognition (ASR) system embedded on a mobile device. Applicants submit that fundamentally the device recited in claim 1 is related to adapting parameters of an ASR system that is embedded in a mobile device which differs from the teachings of Deng et al. because they require a client-server approach in which the continuous speech recognition module is on the server and not on a client or mobile device. This is easily identified in Figure 2 of Deng et al. in which the front end speech processing is on the client and across the network data is sent wherein on the server side is continuous speech recognition. Accordingly, it is clear that Deng et al. fail to teach an automatic speech recognition system that is embedded in a mobile device as is required in claim 1. This is further bolstered by numerous references throughout Deng et al. to this client-server approach. For example, in section 1, paragraph 1 they explain "while spoken language has the potential to provide a natural interactive model, the difficulty in resolving the ambiguity of spoken language and the high computation of requirements in speech technology have so far prevented it from becoming

Application/Control Number: 10/754,927 Art Unit: 2626

mainstream in a computers user interface." Section 2, paragraph 1 states that this section will present the most reasoned results in the framework of distributed speech recognition that the MIPAD design has adopted. Section A cited in the Office Action teaches expressly that a plain phone, PDA, or a smart phone according to a DSR application is "where speech recognition is carried out at a remote server." They teach using a standard CODEC on the device to transmit the speech to the server where it is subsequently decompressed and recognized. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this fundamentally distinguished Deng et al. from claim 1 which requires an ASR system being embedded on a mobile device.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that the particular limitations of claim 1 are not taught in the reference. For example, the means for receiving user account specific adaptation data associated with ASR from a mobile device is not taught in section 1, paragraph 1 inasmuch as there is no reference in this portion of Deng et al. to any "adaptation data" that is received from a mobile device. Next, the means for generating new ASR adaptation parameters using the user specific adaptation data transmitted from the mobile device is also not taught in section 2, paragraph A. There is simply nothing in this portion regarding generating new ASR adaptation parameters based on data received from the mobile device. Section 2, paragraph A merely discusses the basic approach of DSR applications and how speech is transmitted to the server where it is subsequently decompressed and recognized. There is no discussion generating new ASR adaptation parameters in this portion of the reference. Finally, claim 1 recites means for transmitting the new ASR adaptation parameters to the mobile device when a communication channel becomes available, wherein the new ASR adaptation parameters provide improved ASR for the embedded ASR system. As is noted above, Deng et al. require speech recognition to be performed on the server and not on the client or mobile device. Accordingly, this new ASR adaptation parameter is being provided for improved ASR for the "embedded ASR system"

Docket No.: 2003-0017

(which is embedded on a mobile device) cannot be taught by Deng et al. In fact, the reference teaches away from such an approach throughout their teachings. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Deng et al. fail to anticipate each limitation of the claims and in fact, in some respects, teach away from the present invention. Therefore, Applicant submit that claim 1 and dependent claims 2-6 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

Claim 7 recites a mobile device that includes means for performing automatic speech recognition. Applicants have amended claim 7 to recite that the means requires means for performing natural language automatic speech recognition. Inasmuch as claim 7 recites a mobile device, clearly Deng et al. teach away from the mobile device performing natural language automatic speech recognition inasmuch as they push such speech recognition to a server and therefore the remaining limitations of this claim which involve means for receiving new ASR adaptation parameters from the computing device are not taught or suggested in the reference. As noted above, Deng et al. essentially teach away from such an approach. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 7 and dependent claims 8-12 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 recites a method of generating new automatic speech recognition (ASR) parameters on a mobile device which has an embedded ASR system. Accordingly, Applicants submit that based on the discussion above that Deng et al. fail to teach these particular limitations. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 13 and dependent claims 14-18 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

Claim 19 recites a method of generating new ASR parameters associated with an embedded ASR system on a mobile device. Inasmuch as Deng et al. teach away from automatic speech recognition on a mobile device and push it to a server, Applicants submit that the particular limitations that involve receiving new ASR adaptation parameters from the computing

Application/Control Number: 10/754,927 Docket No.: 2003-0017

Art Unit: 2626

device in the network when a communication channel becomes available between the computing device and the mobile device, that Applicants submit the particular interaction between a computing device and the mobile device recited in claim 19 are not taught or suggested in the reference. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 19 and dependent claims 20-23 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

10

Application/Control Number: 10/754,927 Docket No.: 2003-0017

Art Unit: 2626

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections and objections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If necessary, the Commissioner for Patents is authorized to charge or credit the **Novak**, **Druce & Quigg, LLP**, **Account No. 14-1437** for any <u>deficiency or overpayment</u>.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 26, 2007

Correspondence Address:

Thomas A. Restaino Reg. No. 33,444 AT&T Corp. Room 2A-207 One AT&T Way

Bedminster, NJ 07921

Thomas M. Isaacson

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 44,166

Phone: 410-286-9405 Fax No.: 410-510-1433